

27. (Amended) The method of Claim 2, wherein the metallic film is directly disposed on the thin film resistor.

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 26 and 27 remain pending in the application. Claims 5, 6, 12-25 and 28-32 have been cancelled. Claims 7-11, 26 and 27 have been amended. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Information Disclosure Statement filed July 28, 1999 fails to comply with provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because no English translation or equivalence was provided for Japanese reference lettered OR, PR and QR. Applicant apologizes for the confusion regarding these three Japanese references. Each of these three Japanese references have a U.S. equivalent application as listed below.

<u>Reference Letter</u>	<u>JP Reference</u>	<u>U.S. Equivalent</u>
OR	7-335831	08/463,550
PR	10-22452	08/885,192
QR	10-144866	08/965,030

Each of these three U.S. applications were cited in an Information Disclosure Statement filed July 28, 1999. This Information Disclosure Statement was initialed and returned by

the Examiner with Paper No. 4. Thus, the U.S. equivalents of these three Japanese references have been considered by the Examiner. Applicant apologizes for not indicating the relationship between the Japanese references and the U.S. applications at the time of filing the Information Disclosure Statement.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 5, 6, 10, 26, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ruggiero (U.S. Pat. No. 4,878,770). Claims 5, 6 and 28 have been cancelled. Claims 10, 26 and 27 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 8, 9 and 11-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruggiero (U.S. Pat. No. 4,878,770) as applied to Claim 5. Claims 7, 8, 9 and 11 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 1. Claims 12-18 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-21 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagahata (JP 63062746A, English Abstract) in view of Maghsoudnia et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,420,063). Claims 19-21 and 29 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagahata (JP '746A). Claims 22-25 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagahata (JP '746A). Claims 22-25 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Claims 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagahata (JP '746A) in view of Ruggiero (US '770). Claims 31 and 32 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 19, 2002

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt
Reg. No. 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

ATTACHMENT FOR CLAIM AMENDMENTS

The following is a marked up version of amended Claims 7-11, 26 and 27 in which underlines indicates insertions and brackets indicate deletions.

7. (Amended) The method of Claim [5]2, wherein a thickness of the first part is equal to or larger than 20% relative to an entire thickness of the metallic film.

8. (Amended) The method of Claim [5]2, wherein a thickness of the second part is equal to or larger than 100 Å.

9. (Amended) The method of Claim [5]2, wherein the step of dry-etching the metallic film uses an etching gas including CF₄.

10. (Amended) The method of Claim [5]2, wherein the step of wet-etching the metallic film uses an etching solution including H₂O₂.

11. (Amended) The method of Claim [5]2, wherein the metallic film is formed with a thickness equal to or larger than 500 Å.

26. (Amended) The method of Claim [5]2, wherein the metallic film is a single layer.

27. (Amended) The method of Claim [5]2, wherein the metallic film is directly disposed on the thin film resistor.